

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

1-23-2020

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, January 23, 2020

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
January 23, 2020
12:30-1:45

Presiding: Paul Reich, President of the Faculty

Recording minutes: Jennifer Queen, Vice President of the Faculty/Secretary

Members in attendance: Agee; Aggarwal; Althuis; Anderson; Archard; Armenia; Balzac; Boles; Bommelje; Boniface; Brannock; S. Brown; V. Brown; Cannaday; G. Cavanaugh; J. Canvenough; Charles; Cheng; Chong; G. Cook; Crozier; Cummings; Davidson; D. Davison; Diaz-Zambrana; DiQuattro; Douguet; Dunn; Elva; Ewing; Fetscherin; Fokidis; Forsythe; C. Fuse; M. Fuse; Gilmore; Grau; Greenberg; Gunter; Hammonds; Harwell; Heileman; Houston; Hudson; Johnson; Kadiyala; KC; Kiefer; Kincaid; Kistler; Kupetz; Lewin; Lines; Littler; Manak; Maskivker; Mathews; McClure; McLaren; Mohr; Montgomery; Moore; Mosby; Murdaugh; Myers; Myslik; Namingit; Newcomb; Niles; Nodine; Painter; Paniagua; Park; Parsloe; Pett; Pieczynski; Pistor; Poole; Prieto-Calixto; Prosser; Queen; Reich; Richard; Riley; F. Robinson; Roe; Rubarth; Sahm; Santiago Narvaez; Sardy; Schoen; Simmons; B. Stephenson; P. Stephenson; Stone; Summet; Sutherland; Svitavsky; Tillmann; Tome; Vanable; Vidovic; Voicu; Williams; Wilson; Wunderlich; Yankelevitz; Yellen; Yu; W. Zhang; Zimmermann

Invited guests: Maeghan Rampala

- I. Meeting called to order at 12:37pm
- II. Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2019 CLA Meeting
 - a. An amendment was made to the circulated minutes that corrected a colleagues misspelled name.
 - b. Dexter Boniface moved to approve the minutes as amended. Dan Chong seconded.
 - c. Clicker vote: 73 yes votes, 3 no vote, 6 abstentions. Motion passed.
- III. Announcements
 - a. Paul Reich announced Blake Robinson has been confirmed as the Social Sciences—Applied Representative on Curriculum Committee for this semester.
 - b. Deborah Prosser announced that the deadline for FITI and OER grants is March 2nd. Please contact Deborah or Amy Sugar with questions.
- IV. Committee Reports
 - a. Executive Committee waived its time.
 - b. Curriculum Committee; Martina Vidovic reporting.
 - i. Approved some minor changes to the Computer Science curriculum that came about in light of winding down the CMS major in Holt and a need to

align the curriculum to the standards of the industry. There were no changes in the overall number of credits in the major.

- ii. Cleaned up the language in the second bachelor degree policy. Did not change the policy but rather cleaned up confusion within the policy regarding the number of hours needed to obtain the residency, required GPA and such. Discussion mainly focused on differentiating between two types of students (a) Rollins graduates and (b) non-Rollins graduates. The only addition to the policy was added language stating that non-Rollins students will not follow this policy. They will be treated as transfer students and should apply through the appropriate school (CLA or Holt).
 - iii. Approved a change in the English department curriculum that requires English majors to take a 400 level ENG course rather than ENGW (creative writing course).
 - iv. Discussed the proposed Make-Up Policy for College Closures. Policy for campus closures primarily for inclement weather. Asked for some clarifications and will revisit the policy again before voting on it and sending it to the EC.
- c. Faculty Affairs Committee; Don Davison reporting.
- i. Renewed deliberations on the endowed chairs policy that was tabled by the Executive Committee at the end of the spring 2019. Discussion focused on alternative plan that was prepared at the end of the spring semester. Concluded that input from the faculty and endowed chair holders is needed regarding the alternate proposal because it was not discussed in a faculty forum. Endowed chair holders are joining the FAC meeting of February 4, 2020.
 - ii. Drafted 'white paper' that discusses potential sources of bias in course evaluations. Provost Singer and the Director of Institutional Analytics, Meghal Parikh, will present statistics that describe patterns at Rollins at the February 18 meeting of FAC. Then white paper will come to EC for addition to a CLA agenda.
 - iii. Began deliberations to formulate a proposed bylaw regarding the size and membership of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Current and former members of FEC discussed potential bylaw revisions with FAC on January 21, 2020. Also continue move through the recommendations from the Tenure and Promotion Working Group.
 - iv. Endorsed a revised Disruptive Student Policy that will be brought to you today under Business.
 - v. Working with IT to improve delivery of Course Instructor Evaluations to students. IT requested reducing the frequency of email reminders to students to complete their CIEs from daily per course to three (3) times during the open window. Instead, FAC recommended that emails continue to be delivered daily but should include links to all their courses. Response rate at the end of fall 2019 semester was the same as under the previous method. Also asked IT to explore the feasibility of moving course evaluations to Canvas with a separate dashboard. If IT can move the evaluations to Canvas then FAC recommends that it be piloted on a few classes in April.

- vi. Two subcommittees have been formed to look at faculty salaries. The Provost has formed a committee to examine the possibility of salary inequities correlated with race and gender. The committee has met several times. A report summarizing its findings will be delivered to the faculty at the end of the spring semester. A subcommittee of FAC is being formed to work with the Provost and the Director of Institutional Analytics to produce the annual salary report as directed in the Faculty Salary Philosophy.
- vii. Phi Beta Kappa advanced the College to the third round for approval of a chapter. A visitation committee will come to campus this week. Earning a chapter would be an achievement for our campus and, more importantly, for our students. There is a formal schedule for them, but they could change it at any time. If contacted about a meeting, please attend. Committee also may want to visit classes or faculty offices. Please don't throw them out. Thanks in advance for helping.

V. Business

- a. Full-Time, Renewable, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Recommendations
 - i. Ben Hudson moved to approve the recommendations. Chris Fuse seconded.
 - ii. Paul Reich gave a brief history and fielded questions.

Q: When this left FAC last, #6 read that it should constitute no more than 15%. How did this new version evolve? A: That was the document was brought to EC. Currently we are at 19%. There was concern about trying to meet at a 15% number. There was a motion from a member of EC to amend to 15-20% and it passed although not unanimously.

Q: What percentage are our benchmarks at? A: Runs a range from 15-25% or more.

Q: This creates difference tiers of faculty. Was there any discussion of sabbatical or any type of leave or voting? A: There has never been a discussion of sabbatical or leave. As of right now, these are voting members of CLA and all College faculty. It may be that departments have different cultures, but FAC didn't want to wade into that. However, voting rights are already established in the bylaws.

Q: Has the 19% trended up over the years? A: Most of the people in these positions have been here for long time, but there has been an increase in the business department.

Q: As #4 constitutes some kind of promotion, why is there not a CEC? A: We were trying to establish a minimum. English for instance actually does have a three-person committee.

Q: Are they evaluated yearly, and do we want to keep it there? A: Recommendation #2 allows for a multi-year contract that does not require annual reviews.

Q: Stuck on the change to 19%, but I recognize there might be some feeling of concern by the 4% of faculty. A: You could propose an amendment to change the language back to 15%.

POI: Would anyone speak against this potential amendment?

Q: Not really speaking against it, but I would like to present more information. EC doesn't want anyone currently in these positions to feel threatened. This was offered by EC as a compromise between being aspirational at 15% and practical at 20% to ensure that we avoided a drift.

A: Never has there been a serious conversation about letting people go to get to this number, but instead as individuals retire, we have a conversation about how we want to replace these colleagues.

Q: Do we need to be concerned about these numbers when requesting lines for regular faculty and VAPs? A: VAPs are not affected by these policies as they are not renewable. Please be cognizant of when using phrases like "regular" faculty. These are our regular faculty. Many of them have been teaching here for many years.

Q: When would current colleagues be eligible for these changes? A: People would be eligible next year.

Q: Any discussion of the 15% number at the department level? A: Language is very clear that this is an institutional statistic, not departmental.

Q: Want to speak very much in favor of this. Often times these are front line experts in the field. Lecturers are often replacing part time faculty and offer students more stability.

Q: Could part of this move us to conversations about these colleagues as equal to us? A: This seems like a start.

- iii. Ben Hudson moved to amend #6 to read, "Full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track appointments should constitute no more than 15% of the full-time faculty at the institution." Maridath Wilson seconded.

Q: Is this document for us or the administration? A: It is a guiding principle for us and the administration.

Q: Then what we are aspiring to is not some arbitrary number, but avoiding unintended consequences like administration coming back to us and justifying something we don't like. For example, letting go 4% of the current faculty. Therefore, I am against the amendment.

- iv. Clicker vote: 27 yes votes, 67 no vote, 9 abstentions. The amendment failed.

- v. Marc Fetscherin moved to amend #6 to read, "Full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track appointments ideally constitute no more than 15% but should not exceed 20% of the full-time faculty at the institution." Ben Hudson seconded.

- vi. Clicker vote: 53 yes votes, 31 no vote, 5 abstentions. The amendment passed.

- vii. Mark Anderson called the question.

- viii. Clicker vote: 76 yes votes, 8 no vote, 5 abstentions. The amended motion passed (see attached).

b. Disruptive Student Policy

- i. Susan Montgomery moved to endorse the Disruptive Student Policy (see attached). Martina Vidovic seconded.

- ii. Jennifer Cavanaugh and Maeghan Rampala gave brief background on policy and fielded questions.

Q: How often does your office handle something like this? Every ten years or ten per year? A: Our office doesn't just deal with disruption in the classroom

and it varies from year to year. To be clear, this is not taken lightly and it does not happen without serious consideration. Recently we had a case like this, but we had no idea how to handle it because there was no policy.

Faculty member ended up working with us.

Q: (1) Who is keeping track of serially disruptive students? If this is beyond the classroom, then “classroom” should not be in the title. (2) This is written race and gender neutral but in reality, women of color are more likely to be written up and judged more harshly. How are you taking this into account?

(3) How do we make sure that this policy is not abused by faculty? A: (1) Care Team keeps track of significant issues in one place or multiple issues across situations. Ones that are limited to the classroom are generally dealt with that at the course or department level. (2) We are happy to include any inclusive language changes. (3) There are three voices in the policy so that the faculty member is not making the decision on his or her own. These are the checks in place.

Q: The “grade following withdrawal language” seems confusing. Why would a student get a grade for a course they did not complete? A: The faculty member could always send a suggestion back that an NC may be appropriate than a grade.

Q: There needs to be greater clarity on what constitutes disruptive behavior. This language should be reviewed by diversity council. A: Accessibility services has been consulted but diversity council could be consulted as well.

Q: Re: earlier question about grade language. EC was told that it was phrased that way to give faculty discretion and empower them, but it does seem vague and in need of clarification.

iii. Paul Reich moved to table it to next CLA faculty meeting. Jennifer Cavanaugh seconded. Passed by voice vote.

c. Student Life / CLA Standing Committee Governance Reform.

i. In light of time constraints, this conversation was postponed. Paul Reich will send email regarding this item and it will be placed on a CLA meeting agenda in the future.

VI. Motion to adjourn by Anne Murdaugh. Jennifer Queen seconded. Meeting adjourned at 1:45pm.

Full-Time, Renewable, Non-Tenure-Track Faculty¹ Recommendations

The faculty recommends:

1. After six consecutive years of satisfactory performance meeting departmental expectations, full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track faculty be eligible to apply for “senior” designation. This promotion should come with a permanent increase in their salary.
2. After six consecutive years of satisfactory performance, the Provost offer multiyear contracts to full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track faculty. The recommended contract length is 3 years.
3. The Provost establish a date by which contracts renewals are given.
4. Evaluation of full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track faculty be conducted by the department chair and at least one tenured or tenure-track faculty member from the department in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty.
5. Any full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track faculty participating in service activities for which tenure and tenure-track faculty receive additional compensation be compensated at the same rate.
6. Full-time, renewable, non-tenure-track appointments ~~should constitute no more than 15-20%~~ **ideally constitute no more than 15% but should not exceed 20%** of the full-time faculty at the institution.
7. Recommendation #6 should be incorporated into the College’s policies and statements of principle. The other recommendations should be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

¹ In the College of Liberal Arts, these faculty currently serve as lecturers and artists-in-residence.

DISRUPTIVE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR POLICY

Disruptive behavior prohibited: Disruptive behavior in the classroom or during an educational experience is prohibited. The classroom and educational experience includes both the in-person educational experience as well as the on-line educational experience. Disruptive behavior includes conduct that interferes with or obstructs the teaching and learning process. This behavior can occur in front of an entire class, it could take place within a small group, or it could be one-on-one communication between the course instructor and the student. Civil expression of disagreement or views opposing those of the course instructor during the times and using the means permitted by the instructor is not itself disruptive behavior and is not prohibited.

Course instructor – authority and responsibility: The course instructor is authorized to establish rules and other parameters for student behavior and participation during the course or other educational experiences that are supervised by the course instructor.

Temporary removal from class or other educational experience: If a student or students, acting individually or as a group, disrupt or attempt to disrupt the course or another educational experience, the course instructor is authorized to follow several options, depending on the severity and/or frequency of the offending behavior. The course instructor is authorized to instruct the offending student(s) to stop the disruptive behavior or to instruct the offending student(s) to leave the class or educational experience. The course instructor may contact Campus Safety if the student(s) fails to follow the instructor's instruction. The course instructor must immediately call Campus Safety if presented with an unsafe situation, threatening behavior, violence, knowledge of a crime, or similar circumstances.

Interim measure: In the case of severe and frequent offending behavior, the applicable academic dean may, in consultation with the Behavioral Evaluation and Threat Assessment team (BETA), temporarily remove the student(s) from the educational experience pending determination of responsibility under the College's Code of Community Standards.

More information about Rollins' BETA team can be found [here](#).

Code of Community Standards: Violation of this Disruptive Classroom Behavior Policy also constitutes a violation of the Disruptive Behavior policy in the Code of Community Standards.

Referral to Community Standards & Responsibility: Depending on the severity and/or frequency of the offending behavior, the course instructor may refer the student(s) to the Office of Community Standards & Responsibility for further action and possible sanctions under the College's Code of Community Standards.

Withdrawal of student from class or other educational experience: The sanctions which may be imposed on the student(s) who violate this Disruptive Classroom Behavior Policy include, in addition to those sanctions published in the Code of Community Standards, involuntary

withdrawal of the student(s) from the course or other educational experience. The applicable academic dean of the college in which the course or educational experience is located shall work in consultation with the Director of Community Standards & Responsibility, the instructor, and the Dean of Student Affairs to determine whether to involuntarily withdraw the student(s) from the course or other educational experience. This determination will be made only after the published process under the Code of Community Standards has been completed and resulted in a determination of responsibility, including any appeals provided under that process. Students who are withdrawn from a class or other educational experience are not subject to a refund.

Grade following withdrawal from course or other educational experience: The course instructor retains responsibility to award the grade for the course or other educational experience to the student who is involuntarily withdrawn from the course or other educational experience. The grade shall be determined by the course instructor based on the student's academic performance at the point of involuntary withdrawal. Any appeal of the grade awarded by the course instructor shall be through the College's published policy on grade appeals. The student may be permitted to complete the course remotely for a grade, but this would be at the discretion of the academic dean and the instructor.

Appeals under this policy: Any appeal of the determination under the College's Code of Community Standards shall be as stated in the published policy for such appeals. The determination of the applicable academic dean to involuntarily withdraw a student from a course or other educational experience shall be made in writing to the Provost within 3 calendar days following decision by the academic dean. The appeal shall be limited to the determination by the academic dean and shall be based on excessiveness of involuntary withdrawal as a penalty. The Provost's decision on appeal is limited to review of the academic dean's decision to involuntarily withdraw the student from the course or other educational experience. The Provost's decision on appeal is the final decision regarding involuntary withdrawal from the course or other educational experience.